DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 210 CS 013 547

AUTHOR Kang, Dong-Ho
TITLE L2 Children's Reading Conceptions and Its Relationships with Intertextuality.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 2; Primary Education; Protocol Analysis; *Readability; *Reading Attitudes; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Research; Second Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Intertextuality

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper was to investigate how young (second grade) L2 readers constructed intertextual meaning and how to relate their conceptions or beliefs about reading to their intertextuality. L2 readers who moved to America might be influenced by their cultural background which might further affect their reading processes. Though current literature has shown great interest in good readers' intertextual process during reading (Hartman, 1990), little interest was given to poor readers or minority groups' intertextual reading processes. This paper was designed to fill such gap in the reading research literature. The researcher first diagnosed three L2 readers' reading conceptions and self-concept as a reader in both L1 and L2, followed by retrospective miscue analyses to investigate their reading processes. Finally, their criteria about readability and intertextual connections among three Cinderella stories was examined by conducting think-aloud methods. The results show that their reading conceptions of L1 and L2 were influenced by language proficiency, peer group, home literacy environment, and school instruction. Young second readers had their own criteria about readability: vocabulary, picture, story schema or structure, and prior knowledge (schemata). The second young readers' conceptions of reading in both L1 and L2 and their criteria about readability were strongly connected with their intertextuality. (Contains 7 references and a table of data; appendixes contain the complete interview protocols and story retellings.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 210

L2 Children's reading conceptions and its relationships with intertextuality

Reporter: Dong-Ho Kang
(Graduate Student of Language Education at Indiana University)
Address: Dong-Ho Kang
Campus View Apartments #310
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana, 47408, U.S.A.
E-mail address: dkang@indiana.edu

CS 013 547

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to investigate how young L2 readers constructed intertextual meaning and how to relate their conceptions or beliefs about reading to their intertextuality. L2 readers who moved to America might be influenced by their cultural background which might further affect their reading processes. Though current literature has shown great interest in good readers' intertextual process during reading (Hartman, 1990), little interest was given to poor readers or minority groups' intertextual reading processes. This paper was designed to fill such gap in the reading research literature.

The researcher first diagnosed three L2 readers' reading conceptions and self-concept as a reader in both L1 and L2, followed by retrospective miscue analyses to investigate their reading processes. Finally, their criteria about readability and intertextual connections among three Cinderella stories was examined by conducting think-aloud methods. The results show that their reading conceptions of L1 and L2 were influenced by language proficiency, peer group, home literacy environment, and school instruction. Young second readers had their own criteria about readability: vocabulary, picture, story schema or structure, and prior knowledge (schemata). The second young readers' conceptions of reading in both L1 and L2 and their criteria about readability were strongly connected with their intertextuality.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Introduction

Reading researchers seemed to presuppose that only good or adult readers made intertextual connections. The purpose of this study was to examine second young kids' intertextual meaning making processes. Their social cultural literacy environments might influence their conceptions or beliefs about reading in L1 and L2 and further their criteria about readability might depend on their cultural background. The researcher believes that their beliefs about reading in L1 and L2 and readability might be related to their intertextual connections among stories they have read. Whole language proponents argued that "school instruction such as subskill, skill, and wholistic view, influence children's beliefs about reading and further claimed the relationships between children's reading conceptions and self-concept as a reader" (Goodman et al., 1987). Traditional reading instruction focusing on subskill or skill model could cause children to feel bad as a reader, because good readers' characteristics are errorless performance, while children with wholistic, meaning-based model, feel good as a reader because they think readers make meaning from the text.

However, L2 readers' self-concept as readers as well as their conceptions in both L1 and L2 might be different and further influenced by their different socio-cultural literacy environments such as home literacy environment or peer group as well as school instruction. Self-concept as a reader can be defined as "Conceptualization and evaluations of the self, either present or possible as a reader" (Mathewson, 1994). His reading model shows how attitude and motivation influence their intention to read and they are further influenced by self-concept as a reader. These multiple sources of social cultural environments might further guide second readers' self-concept as readers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the other hand, Hartman (1990) defined a reader as "generators of interconnections or links between texts" (p. 617). Meaning does not reside in the single text, but beyond the text, that is, in the multiple texts, i.e., within the reader, beyond a single text, or transaction between two. Readers construct meaning, but continuously reconstruct meaning by connecting multiple texts. Children possess different beliefs about reading. Some children believe that reading is how to sound out exactly, while others believe that reading is understanding the words or the whole story. Children's intertextual links might be constructed in the word-level as well as in the whole text or the idea in relation to their conceptions of reading. Whatever they believe about reading, every child does construct links between texts, but in the different levels: word, structure, or the whole story (idea). The researcher wants to investigate what children do when they are confronted with multiple texts and how their intertextuality is related to their conceptions of reading which are further influenced by their background.

2. Methods

For the purpose of this study, three young L2 readers took part in the research. The 8 year-old male reader, J.Y. (2nd grade), has been staying about 2 years in America. J.U. who is 8 year-old female (2nd grade), was born in America, but her home language is Korean. K.H., 9 years old (2nd grade) has moved to America 8 months ago. They are all attending both American elementary school and Korean weekly school (2 hours a week).

Three methods were used: Burker's Reading Interview, Reading Miscue Analysis and Retelling story (Goodman,. et al., 1987), and think-aloud method (Hartman, 1990). The first part consisted of reading interview and oral reading miscue analysis followed by retelling procedure. The purpose of this procedure was to investigate their reading conception, self-concept as a reader, and their reading

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

process, that is, reading strategies. Think-aloud method was conducted to examine how each student connected each story and constructed meaning. For the purpose of intertextual connections or intercultural connections, three versions of Cinderella stories were read and think-aloud by readers: American Cinderella, Korean Cinderella, and Egyptian Cinderella. Finally, they were asked the difficulty of three stories after reading to identify their criteria of readability.

The think-aloud protocols were conducted while reading the last story. Sometimes their think-aloud protocols were followed by prompt questions by the researcher. The superscripts above the protocols, which were preceded by the text, were where the readers marked the text to think-aloud. The protocols were classified into several patterns. The classification of the patterns was based on two criteria: linguistic units (word, structure, or the whole story) and locations of texts children referenced (primary endogenous, secondary endogenous, and exogenous) (Hartman, 1990). The researcher adopted the terms used by Hartman (1990) to avoid the ambiguity in this study. The content was organized as follows: each reader's reading interview and retrospective miscue analyses, their readability, and intertextuality under the title of each reader.

3. Results

(1) Word-based Egocentric Reader: JY

This child's reading interview protocols gave us a sense of his beliefs about reading in both Korean and English.[1] The following protocols showed his conception of reading in Korean which was followed by his beliefs about English reading (Goodman et al., 1987):

---

[1]See appendix for the whole interview protocols

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

R: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: Just skip it. Anything else? J: Sound out. or ask father.
R: What did you ask your father? J: Words.
J: My father said to me, "You can not read a book well."

R: Who is a Good Reader you know? J: I can read very well now.
R: What makes her (Korean friend in Korean weekly school) a good reader?
J: She doesn't make any mistake while reading a textbook. But I make one or two mistakes.
R: When she comes to something she doesn't know, what do you think she does?
J: If JH make a mistake, she repeat it again or look around them. or The teacher told her.
R: What would you like to do better as a reader? J: Read a lot of books.
R: Do you think you are a good reader? J: Yes.
R: Why? J: I learned how to read.

Reading Interview(English)

R: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: Ask my father. J: Sound out. (In case of reading alone)
R: What makes her (his English teacher) a good reader? J: She learned to read.
R: What would your teacher do to help that person? J: Tell him.
R: What would she tell him?
J: She will tell him how to pronounce and the meaning of the words.
R: How did your teacher teach to read?
J: My teacher wrote on the blackboard. She read it to me and I followed her.
R: Did you understand it? J: I just repeat it. I know a little.
R: What would you like to do better as a reader?
J: Practice and know the meaning of the words or ask my dad.
R: Do you think you are a good reader?
J: No, because there are a lot of difficult words I can't understand.
R: Do you think you are a good reader in Korean? J: No.
R: You said, "You are a good reader in Korean." last time.
J: But, my father said to me, "You can not read Korean very well".
(Second review) I can read silently, but I make a few mistakes while reading orally.

JY believes that reading was how to sound out exactly. He was concerned about making a mistake rather than reading for meaning. He knows that once he practices a lot, he can read or sound out exactly. He has some confidence in Korean because he feels his reading skill improved in two

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

years. He thinks that he is a better reader in Korean than in English, even though his father made him think he is a poor reader. His conceptions of reading look like a subskill model in both Korean and English. His self-concept as a reader seems to be influenced by his home environment or his improvement in Korean. Even though he was concerned about sounding out exactly, not about meaning, he feels good as a reader in Korean. How he believes about reading does not predict his self-concept as a reader (Goodman et al., 1987). The Reading interview protocol in English also shows that his school instruction might influence his reading conception.

The retrospective oral reading miscue analyses support his belief about reading after reading Korean Cinderella as follows:

> R: When you have difficult words, what did you do?
> J: If there is c,i,n,d,e,r,e,l,l, and a, I just imitate to sound it out. (Subskill model)

His belief about reading shows us how to use reading strategies while reading. His main concern was about how to sound out similarly. Most of his oral reading miscues consisted of graph-phonic similarity. While reading this story, he had trouble, but he tried to sound out the words which he did not know: murmuring or sounding out similarly, but abnormal words. Sometimes, he just skipped the words and continued to read. He was trying to show me that he can read that story. Because I thought he focused on sounding out the words, I predicted that he would not have recalled the story much. However, he was comprehending the story, sometimes skipping the details during reading[2]. He also used cueing systems such as pictures. These reading strategies matched his reading interview

---

[2]See Appendix: his retelling story of Korean Cinderella.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

protocols.

Children's readability might vary, based on their own criteria, which enabled them to read that story. Children seem to possess their own criteria about readability which are strongly connected with their intertextual connections. The first reader, JY, who believes that good readers can read well, does not lack confidence with Korean because he thought that he can read very well now. His criteria about readability were related to his beliefs about reading and strategies as follows:

Korean Cinderella < American Cinderella < Egyptian Cinderella

difficult <----------> easy

He rated the difficulty before reading them. When I asked him to choose one story among stories on the table, he first saw the number of pictures and then the size of the letters. Even though American Cinderella was much shorter and easier than Korean or Egyptian Cinderella, he picked up Korean and Egyptian Cinderella. However, he would not intent to read American Cinderella. Even though he watched the American Cinderella on T.V., he still refused to read it because he thought that it had few pictures and consisted of many words or sentences in one page. Schema or familiarity with that story does not seem to work very well with this child. The interesting thing was his intent to read the story which I thought was so difficult to read. Children's own criteria about readability might influence their intention to read (Mathewson, 1994). After reading two stories, he was asked to rate three stories. He rated the order above. When I asked him why he put Egyptian Cinderella at the end of the line, he answered that it has a lot of difficult words. His criteria were pictures and size or number of words on a page before reading, and difficulty of the vocabulary after reading, which accounted for his perceptions of reading, i.e., focusing on words.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It would be interesting to see how this child made intertextual meaning construction after reading two or three stories. The following think-aloud protocols showed how his beliefs about reading and criteria about readability were connected with his intertextuality. His protocols were classified into several patterns.

(A) Intratextual Connection within primary endogenous text

The following protocol shows how his criteria about readability or his view of text, that is, picture and letter size, was connected with his intratextual connection.

> Although her **master**[2] was kind, he was old and liked to doze beneath a fig tree. He seldom heard the servant girls tease Rhodopis. He never saw them ordering her about. (Text)
> Protocol: "The person appeared beforehand and he became a master."

The above protocol indicates that his view of the text seems to include both pictures and a written text. In fact, the person, "master", appeared first time, in this story, but he mentioned that he appeared before. The picture of the person appeared at the left page and the written text at the right side of the page. He always looked at the pictures at the left and further read the written text. He interpreted the picture as one part of the story or the text rather than as an extra cueing system of the written text. This was strongly related to his criteria about readability.

The following protocol shows that his conception of reading, that is, how to sound out exactly, strongly influenced his intertextual reading processes:

> "Mend my robe!" "I'm hungry, Rhodopis! Bake the **bread**[4]!" (Text)
> Protocol: (When I show some attention when he was marking the word, "bread")
> J: No. I thought it was "bread" and I was trying to mark it. But it was not "bread", but "bready". So I erased the mark.
> R: What does it mean by "bread" and "bready"? J: "Bread" is [ppang] (meaning "bread" in Korean). But when I read it again, it was "bready".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

R: What does it mean by "bready"? J: I don't know.

The above protocol indicates that he focused on the relationship between sounds and letters. Before meaning-making process, he first identified the letter forms to match his vocabulary icons. First time, he thought it was a familiar word, but when he considered it as a different word, he gave up processing. He was concerned about graph-phonic similarity during reading.

(B) Word (primary endogenous) to word (exogenous: personal experience) Connection

He connected the story with his personal experience. His conception of reading, focusing on words or sounding out, still was related to his intertextual connections as follows:

> "Hurry, Rhodopis!" they would shout at her. "The **geese**[3] are in the garden, eating up the onions!" (Text)
> Protocol: " I saw geese in the zoo and in the water."

> Her master ordered a pair of dainty slippers made especially for Rhodopis. The soles were of real leather, and the toes were gilded with rose-red **gold**[8]. (Text)
> Protocol: "Gold" is [kum] (translating in Korean). At school, I made trill or trailer. My teacher said, "Gold is useful.", as you know. She asked me."

These protocols shows that he connected specific words with his personal experience, but translating them into Korean sometimes. He was still concerned about words, not with the whole event or the whole experience. The level of intertextuality restricted to a word-level. His reading conception seems to be related to his intertextual meaning making process.

(C) Word (primary endogenous) to word (exogenous: texts outside the current task) Links

He focused on the specific words and connected them with other stories which he had read before.

> Long ago, in the land of **Egypt**[1], where the green Nile River widens to meet the blue sea, there lived a maiden called Rhodopis.(Text)
> Protocol: "Egypt is the name of the person. I saw it in the Bible."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Shame!" cried Rhodopis, shaking her paddle. "You splattered mud on my **beautiful**[11] slippers!" (Text)
Protocol: "I watched it on T.V. I saw "beautiful". They said, "beautiful"."
R: So far do you have in mind any connection among stories you read?
J: Yes, it is. "Beautiful" appeared in my video.

He still focused on the connections between words among texts he had read as well as among video-tapes he had watched. However, he was still trying to make intertextual connections among stories he has read, but in the word-level, and hence he could seldom find any relationships as follows:

That is the will of the gods." Amasis dismissed the court, called for his chariot, and **began**[13] his search at once. (Text)
Protocol: "Began" appeared in the video tape, "Cinderella".
R: When or where did it appear?
J: I forgot it, but it appeared any way.
R: So far do you find any connection among stories you have read?
J: While I am reading, I am trying to find something in the "American Cinderella". But I can't find anything.

The last dialogues indicates that children focusing on words continuously made connections among stories. However, focusing on relationships between words hindered children's intertextual processes.

(D) Word to the whole story and Delayed: intertextual connection

Some interesting or important words might prompt the whole story or event (concept or idea) he/she read or watched. However, this intertextual connection consisted of a little small part of his think-aloud protocols.

They were so **angry**[14] on their return that even seeing Rhodopis without her rose-red slipper did not please them. "Slaves are better off barefoot," snapped Kipa. (Text)
Protocol: "Angry" appeared in my video tape. The queen was trying to kill the lady, that is, the princess. The queen commanded that the hunter should bring her heart back, but it was not her heart, but pig's heart, because the hunter did not want to kill her. When the queen asked the magic mirror, "who is the most beautiful in the world", it answered, "the princess". The queen was so "angry" (in English), she threw out the pig's heart in the basement."
R: Do you know the title name of the video tape?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J: Cinderella (very positively in a high tone).
R: Are you sure? J: Yes, I am.

(After reading a few sentences, he suddenly stop reading and think alone)

R: Something wrong? J: I am thinking about the video tape.
J: I am wondering if "Cinderella" appeared in the video tape I saw. And I am thinking if the story of the video tape is similar to "Cinderella".
R: Why do you think about it suddenly? J: I am thinking if the story is wrong or not.
R: Do you have anything in your mind? J: Wait a minute!
(He was thinking about it and he suddenly said)
"Huh! there are something wrong in here (in English)". (He said) "Please stop here!".
R: O.K. Go head! Tell me anything! J: It is not "Cinderella". It is "Snow White".
R: Do you want to continue to read or tell me something else? J: I will continue to read.

He might emphasize the word, "angry", which could make it occur to him similar story with the Cinderella. Even though he failed to match the story, he recognized it after reading a few sentences. This fact indicates that children's intertextuality does not always occur on the spot during reading. It might occur after reading as well as during reading.

(D) Bilingual translation (or paraphrasing)

Second readers might make comprehension processes in terms of both languages.

Rhodopis found friends among the animals **instead**[5]. Birds ate crumbs from her hands.
Protocol: "Instead" means [tashin-ae] (translating in Korean)."

One evening, Kipa, who was chief among the servant girls, announced, "**Tomorrow**[9] we
Protocol: "Tomorrow is [Naeil] (translating in Korean). Last night I said, "I will play with you tomorrow.(in English)"

I am wondering why he continues to translate them into his native language. It might be that he was trying to show me off that he knows the meaning of the words. The other alternative interpretation was that L2 young readers interpreted the text interchangeably between L1 and L2. However, his

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conception of reading might cause his reading behavior: focusing on the words. The bilingual translation or paraphrasing did not occur in the protocols of the other two readers.

Children also have their own reader stance, that is, their assumptions about intertextual links, which Hartman (1990) has called "discourse stance". The following dialogue indicates how to approach a story to make intertextual connections during reading, "intertextual preference", which I called. After reading introductory part of the story, he was asked the following questions:

R: Do you have any idea in your mind? J: " No, I don't like this."
R: What do you like? J: "Anything."
R: You don't like everything in this story? J: No.
R: Why? J: "Because I didn't see this in other stories I have read."

He was searching for similar stories or events. However, the important thing was that he has his own voice in relation to intertextual links. The following protocol indicates that he revealed his own voice beyond the author's voice (discourse of egocentricism), but his own voice restricted to a word-level as follows:

"I like "tomorrow", because I can see (my friends) again"

(2) Word to whole story-based Logocentric reader (KH)

This kid is more proficient in L1 (Korean) than in L2 (English), because she was excellent in L1 before moving to America. Her reading protocols show some differences between L1 and L2:

(Korean interview followed by English interview)

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
   Read over and over, repeat,
   What is something you don't know? The whole story or content.
3. What makes her (SM) a good reader?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

She reads a lot of books. She likes to read books. She usually reads books.

5. Suppose she comes to something she doesn't know, What do you think she would do?
She doesn't stop reading and keep reading from the beginning to the end of the story. She can catch the caption words on the bottom of the T. V. screen so fast because she likes to read books and read them a lot.

9. What would you like to do better as a reader?
Read a lot and keep a journal after reading a book. Because I can reflect the story after that.

10. Do you think you are a good reader? So and so Why? I'm not interested in reading books.

Reading Interview (English)

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
Look up words and ask my friends difficult words.
What is a difference between Korean and English Korean is easier than English.
My mon and me look up words in case of English stories, because it is more difficult for my mom to read sometimes.

3. What makes them (Margret and Amile) a good reader?
They like to read books. During a break, they read books.
Margrett read so fast. They read books a lot.

5. Suppose she comes to something she doesn't know, What do you think she would do?
Ask her teacher.
How about Amile? Ask friends or a teacher.
But if friends answer differently, they ask a teacher.

9. What would you like to do better as a reader? Ask a teacher more frequently.

10. Do you think you are a good reader? No.
Why? I don't like those books I read at school. And I just pretended to read them.
But I have many books which my dad bought for me. I like those books and read them.

She believes that reading is for meaning to the whole story in L1. However, she always looked up difficult words in the dictionary while reading L2 stories, without looking at the context in the story. Her poor language proficiency in English and her home literacy environment might account for this change. This reading strategy seems to be influenced by home literacy environment: My mom and me look up words while reading English stories. Informal interview with her mother supports this belief:

> "In Korea we always look up words in the dictionary and many people recommended this strategy when studying English."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The retrospective reading miscue analyses in English showed that she was trying to find the meaning of the difficult word within the word. The following word is what she made a miscue while reading "Stone Soup": e.g. wayfarers (meaning traveler). From the retrospective interview, when she came to some words she could not understand, she did not focus on the previous context. She focused on analyzing the word itself and was trying to guess the meaning. She answered that it means "far away" from the meaning of "far". She did not use any cueing system such as previous context, syntactic cues (noun), and so on.

However, these differences between two languages might be temporal. Once she improves her proficiency level in English, she might read for meaning, because she still believes that reading is for fun or enjoying in both L1 and L2. Her beliefs about good readers' characteristics predicted her self-concept as a reader in both languages. Language proficiency does not seem to predict her self-concept as a reader. She felt that she was poor as a reader in Korean even though she was proficient reader.

KH's criteria about readability were a little bit different from JY's. She read Korean Cinderella and English Cinderella written in Korean before moving to America. For her, familiarity with those stories was important criteria to choose that story. She rated the difficulty of three stories as follows:

difficult: E.C. < A.C. < K.C. : easy (Schema or cultural familiarity)

But, after reading stories, vocabulary difficulty: K.C. < E.C. < A.C. (Vocabulary)

She rated Korean Cinderella as the easiest one, which her cultural familiarity with the story might influence her criteria. After reading two stories, Egyptian Cinderella and Korean Cinderella, she was asked to rate them. Her main concern was vocabulary difficulty. Considering her reading interview protocols in English, i.e., looking up words, reading conception seemed to related to her criteria about

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

readability. However, her basic linguistic unit in Korean was "the whole story". Two conceptions in both L1 and L2 (word versus whole story) might influence her intertextual connections.

Her think-aloud protocols showed that she connected specific words (or concept/idea) in the primary endogenous text with the whole story or small event in other stories she had read. The intertextual meaning making processes contrasted with JY's word to word intertextuality.

(A) Word (primary endogenous) to the whole story (exogenous: personal experience) Links

KH related the story or specific word to her personal experience like JY as follows:

" It would raise its huge head from the **muddy5** water and prick its small ears to listen." (Text)
Protocol: "When I played frita with my friends, males caught females. If males touched us, we have to stay motionless. While one of us was trying to flee, she stopped in the muddy water. It is funny."

KH's intertextuality was a little different from JY's in that she connected specific words within a primary endogenous text with the whole event which she experienced before. This indicated that her poor language proficiency in English might hinder her intertextuality (focusing on words), but she related them to her personal story (L1 influence). The following protocols showed the similar processes.

(B) Word/phrase (concept or idea) to the whole story (exogenous texts outside three Cinderella stories) Links

KH also focused on specific words or phrases which might be impressive or meaningful to her and she related them to the small event or story which she had read or watched as follows:

"He never saw them ordering her about. "Hurry, Rhodopis!" they would shout at her. "The geese are in the garden, **eating up the onions[2]**!" (Text)
Protocol: " There was Peter Rabbit in the story I have read. He went to the Mr. Macgrethy garden and he ate up onions. Mr. Macgrethy was so angry that he was trying to catch this rabbit."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rhodopis found friends among the animals instead. **Birds**[3] ate crumbs from her hands. (Text)

> Protocol: "Birds appeared in the story, Pocahontas. In this story a monkey appeared, but a raccoon dog appeared in Pocahontas. In Pocahontas birds helped a raccoon dog like birds in this story."
> R: How did birds help her in this story?
> K: Birds became her friends.

The above protocols showed that even though she mentioned specific words, she compared the events in the text with the stories which she has read before. It seems that she was concerned about the concept or idea of the specific words or phrases, not about the pronunciation, that is, how to sound out. She sometimes connected similar situations (first protocols) or distinguished two similar situations (the second protocol). Her intertextual connections were similar to her meaning making connections among three Cinderella stories below.

(C) Word (Concept/idea) to the whole story (secondary endogenous) Links

KH seems to empathize with some impressive words and then relate them to other Cinderella stories which she has read so far.

"There will be feasting," added a third. **"Poor Rhodopis**[7]! You must stay behind," Kipa jeered. "You have linen to wash and grain to grind and the garden to weed." (Text)

> Protocol: "Here is poor Rhodopis! Korean Cinderella is poor. In both stories (American and Korean Cinderella) there is a stepmother. While her father was staying together, the stepmother was so kind to her, but while absent, she and her daughter were so mean to Cinderella. In American Cinderella it was similar, but Cinderella was not poor. In both Egyptian Cinderella and American Cinderella she was not poor before her stepmother came to the house. Since then she was poor. But Korean Cinderella was poor from the beginning of the story. Every Cinderella doesn't have their natural mother."

The word, "poor", let her distinguish two situations, happy days and sad days. She drew some similarities or differences between two stories. These protocols made specific distinctions between KH and JY. JY picked up some words and connected them with similar words or similar sounds, which

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

appeared in other stories, while KH mentioned some words/phrases, and connected them with the whole events, but her main concern was about the meaning of the words, not the sounds. KH seems to be aware that reading is meaning to the whole story and her basic linguistic unit is "whole story," not separate words or sentences.

(D) Delayed Intertextual Connections among three stories

The following two protocols showed that intertextual meaning connections did not always occur on the spot during reading. The following protocol supported KH's delayed intertextual reading processes. After finishing the Egyptian story, she was asked as follows:

> R: Can you tell me some similarities or differences among stories?
> K: I don't know.
> R: You have read Korean Cinderella in Korea, haven't you?
> Why don't you read it again in English? (She is looking at Korean Cinderella briefly)
> K: Three stories look similar. The stepmother made Korean Cinderella and Egyptian Cinderella work so hard. They were poor but they became happy. In three stories somebody helped Cinderella. Mice and dock helped American Cinderella and Ox and sparrows helped Korean Cinderella and birds and an eagle helped her in Egypt.

Children intertextual meaning making might occur during reading, after reading, or in a while after reading. They continuously construct and reconstruct meaning.

KH possessed her own reader stance: "logocentric reader" in that she focused on the author's idea or events, not her own. She combined endogenous texts with exogenous texts. She suddenly went back to the introductory part of the story during reading:

> K: "Suddenly something occurred to me. Rhodopis was Cinderella (showing the title of the story). But the name of Cinderella in this story is Rhodopis (in Egyptian Cinderella). Korean Cinderella, her name, is Kongji (in Korean Cinderella). But the title name of each story is Cinderella. For example, Peter Penn was the main character's name as well as the title name."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

She recognized that each main character, Rhodopis and Konji, stands for Cinderella by providing some evidence: Peter Penn. She referenced the texts instead of her own idea. She lacks her own voice unlike JY. The following protocol showed the same reader stance:

> She twirled so lightly that her tiny bare feet scarcely touched the ground. One evening her master awakened to see her **dance[6].** (Text)
> Protocol: In this story she danced very well. Like in Alibaba [totuk] (meaning "thief" Korean) (The Arabian Night) one girl danced very well and she killed the thief. She knows that he was a thief. While dancing with a knife, she killed him. In both stories she danced very well and the men praised her, but in Alibaba the dancer killed him because he was a thief."

3. Structure(plot)-based Logocentric Reader: JU

JU was born in America. She speaks Korean at home, but she uses English most of time at school or in the playground. She is more proficient in English than in Korean, compared with the first two readers. Her reading interview protocols are as follows: (Korean interview and English interview)

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: You mean understanding the words or just reading the words? (R): Both.
When I don't understand words, I just read it and get it out of the lines.
And later on, I go back and check it again and look at the words and study it again.
3. What makes JY a good reader? He reads well.
(R) Do you think he can understand once he reads only?
No, not really. But, most of the time he knows what the words mean.
5. When he comes to something he doesn't know, What do you think he would do?
Ask them around, Read the whole sentence over and over again,

Reading Interview(English) JU

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
Ask parents what it means/
(R) What do you think is something you don't know? Words.
(R) What is something you don't know in Korean? Sentence.
3. What makes him (Bread) a good reader? He reads fast and nicely aloud.
He doesn't have trouble reading words.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. When he comes to something he doesn't know, What do you think he would do?
   He just read and think about it.
9. What would you like to do better as a reader? Understand words I don't understand.
10. Do you think you are a good reader? Bad reader.

The reading interview protocols show that she believes that reading is for meaning to the words. She believes that she should understand as many words as she can, to be a good reader. Her beliefs about good readers are that they can read very well as well as understand words in both L1 and L2. This indicates that she has a skill model view about reading, which caused her to feel as a bad reader. Reading difficult books in English made her feel poor as a reader because she could not read so fast and understand every word. This indicates that children with skill-based views might lack confidence with reading difficult stories, even though she is a proficient reader for her age. Story retelling indicates that JU was the most proficient reader in English among three children as well as for her age. She recalled every detail of the story after reading the Egyptian Cinderella.[3]

JU possessed different criteria about readability from the first two readers' readability: JY and KH. After reading two stories Korean Cinderella and Egyptian Cinderella, she rated them as follows:

difficult: Egyptian < Korean < American : easy

The following dialogue shows her criteria:

(R) Do you think the Egyptian Cinderella is more difficult than the first story to read?
(JU) More difficult.
(R) Really, Why?
(JU) There are more words I don't understand and it is really complicated.
(R) Why do you think it's more complicated?

---

[3]See Appendix: her retelling story

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(JU) It has much more details in it.

Her main criteria were story schema (plot) and vocabulary. The Egyptian Cinderella had a little different story structure from the others. There were no specific animals who help the main character in the story. In addition there were no specific distinctions between events, even though the plot was similar to the others. This criteria seemed to be related to her intertextuality.

Unlike the first two readers, JU did not mark specific words, but she focused on the whole story or event. She stopped reading after each event, summarized within a primary endogenous text or compared events or characters between a primary endogenous text and secondary endogenous texts. For JU, her criteria about readability accounted for her intertextuality, rather than beliefs about reading (criteria: structure (plot) and vocabulary). In addition her intertextual links restricted to endogenous texts, not to exogenous texts such as personal experience or outside current texts.

(A) Intratextual Connections: Primary endogenous texts

The following protocols showed links within primary endogenous texts (Hartman, 1990).

> Protocol after reading first event:
> "I am thinking that Pear Blossom had new mother and sister one day. Her stepmother and stepsister alike are going to store to get something, I thought. And the hoarse voice might be like someone else calling to her. That is it."

> Protocol after reading second event:
> "They are really gonna mad at her. Peony gonna make Pear Blossom like jug closure up and . . . everything. And make her puddle again. Her stepmother get her more work to do."

She consistently summarized each event while reading the first two events. However, she compared the primary endogenous text with secondary endogenous texts after reading the first two events. The following pattern showed how she connect events or characters.

(B) The event (primary endogenous) to the whole story (secondary endogenous) Links

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> "They have a lot of differences. She has only one sister. And there is no part like doing everything like that so much, not that much part. But she does not talk about jugging food like onion, the whole size of onion. American Cinderella does not tell anything about putting them in the open (jar). And there is no hoarse voice in the American Cinderella."
>
> "Both of them (American and Korean Cinderella) are similar because they helped her. Frog doesn't look like mice and he doesn't fight like mice. The birds and mice can jump us big as a frog. And the birds and mice did not have magic."

The interesting difference between the first two readers and JU was that JU did not stick to words but tried to compared each event or characters among stories. This intertextual links were related to their criteria about readability: story schema (plot).

She also seems to possess logocentric reader stance like KH. Her intertextual meaning making was located in the endogenous texts by supplying the contents which the author used, not her own preference or voice. The following protocol was one of the examples:

> "Uh, um. In English Cinderella, Cinderella went to the ball and in Korean Cinderella she went to the festival. It is sort of make sense, she loses shoes there and she has a good time and she just runs away. The magistrate is sort like a prince and chasing after her, but he wants a girl. And then he said the girl who has a right size of foot that fits this shoe, she will be my wife. That is sort like prince saying. It is just like both of them saying that whoever matches this shoe will be my wife. And stepmother and stepsister got real angry."

4. Summary and Conclusion

The following table showed how multiple sources influenced second young readers' conceptions of reading in both L1 and L2 (see Appendix for full interview protocols):

Influence on conceptions	Korean	English
JY (Subskill /(Sub)skill view)	School instruction & parents	School instruction
KH (Wholistic /Skill view)	Peer group and home literacy	Home literacy environment, or language proficiency.
JU(Skill view/ Skill view)	Language proficiency and Korean school instruction	Language proficiency

<Table 1>

The above table showed a little difference between L1 and L2. Second language readers' L1 reading conception became changed a little in L2 reading conception, except JU's case.[4] Different literacy environments seemed to influence their previous beliefs about reading in L1. For JY, Korean weekly school instruction and home literacy behavior influenced his subskill view of reading in Korean. American school instruction explained why he was concerned about meaning to words as well as sounding out exactly in English (skill view of reading).

KH's basic view of reading looks like wholistic view of reading in Korean. She was concerned about meaning to the whole story (her linguistic unit: whole story and keeping a journal) and she believes good readers' characteristics are "enjoying reading". This belief about reading was influenced

[4]JU was born in America and hence her literacy environments are similar, compared with the other two kids.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by her best friend in Korea and her mother's home literacy behavior. However, two basic reasons, home literacy behavior and language proficiency, caused her to focus on meaning to words during L2 reading (skill view) and further her mother's view of L2 reading instruction was influenced by foreign language learning environments in Korea. However, her view of reading in L2 was not constant, because her beliefs about good readers' characteristics in L1 did not change in L2.

For JU, her beliefs about reading were similar between L1 and L2 (skill view), which was influenced by both Korean weekly instruction and American instruction respectively. However, her reading strategies and basic linguistic units depended on her language proficiency level. The results indicated that different literacy environments (home literacy or peer group) as well as school instruction accounted for the differences or changes between bilingual children's L1 reading and L2 reading conceptions.

Heath (1983) investigated the influence of family and cultural values on schooling. Her ethnographic study indicates that minority children with different literacy practice might have difficulty in mainstream school environment. However, the data did not indicate specific cultural differences between L1 and L2. If we define "culture" as "a socially constructed small literacy environments that is situationally defined and redefined within and across differing groups", not in terms of a broad definition (Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992), these small cultural literacy environments, i.e., home literacy and school, influenced their conceptions of reading in L1 and L2 and further changed their conception of L1 reading into a little different one in L2.

The second finding was that children's criteria about readability were not fixed, but diverse. Overall, they had common criteria: vocabulary, but they also had their own particular criteria: pictures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

or numbers of words (JY); schemata or cultural familiarity (KH); and story schema or plot (JU). Our assumption of schemata (familiarity) did not always work with every child in evaluating the difficulty of the texts (see JY). As meaning was located in multiple texts, readability criteria was not fixed, but open to different readers.

Meaning was consistently constructed and reconstructed by readers through reading. As the researcher hypothesized that even second young readers made intertextual connections among texts, three readers made links between texts in this study. Meaning making processes by readers occurred during reading, after reading or in some time after reading (see delayed intertextuality). Children made intertextual connections by combining endogenous texts with exogenous texts (see the patterns of intertextuality). In addition children possessed their own reader stances: egocentric (JY) and logocentric (KH and JU). The discourse stance, which Hartman (1990) called, showed how they construct meaning: a reader's own voice versus an author's voice.

The L2 readers' intertextual connections between multiple texts were strongly connected with their conceptions of reading in L1 and L2 and their criteria about readability. JY believes that reading is how to sound out exactly and his basic linguistic unit was "a word-level". His intertextual links restricted to a word-level. KH's basic linguistic unit was "the whole story" in Korean even though her poor language proficiency in English and home literacy environment caused her to focus on separate words. Her think-aloud protocols indicates that she connected separate words in the primary endogenous text with the whole story or whole experiences. Her beliefs about reading accounted for this preference: reading is for meaning to the whole story or for fun. In other words, she was concerned about the meaning of the words or phrases, not about the sounds. In case of JU, she

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

believes that reading is understanding words as well as sounding out. However, she was concerned about the story structure during reading, i.e., readability. This accounted for why she made intertextual connections within endogenous texts, not with the exogenous texts. She always compared each event between three stories, but she never situated the primary endogenous text in relation to other exogenous texts such as her own experiences.

References

Goodman, Y.M., Watson, D., & Burke,C. (1987). *Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures*. New York: Richard C. Owen.

Hartman, D. K. (1994). The intertextual links of readers using multiple passages: A postmodern/semiotic/cognitive view of meaning making. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of reading*(pp. 616-636). Newark, Delware: International Reading Assoication.

Heath, S.B. (1983). Ways with words. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mathewson, G. C. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of reading*(pp. 1131-1161). Newark, Delware: International Reading Assoication.

Moll, L.C. (1992). Literacy research in community and classrooms: A sociocultural approach. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 211-244). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Ruddell, R.B. & Unrau, N. J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-constructing process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of reading*(pp. 996-1056). Newark, Delware: International Reading Assoication.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group. (1992). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining learning: Roots of educational reform* (pp. 119-150). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Appendix 1

Reading Interview(Korean) JY

R: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: just skip it.
R: What do you skip about ? J: I don't know.
R: Do you ever do something else? J: sound out. or ask father.
R: What did you ask you father? J: Words.
J: My father said to me, "You can not read a book well."
(Second review) "You can't say very well."
R: Who is a Good Reader you know? J: I don't know.
R: Think about anyone around you!
J: I can read very well now.
R: Do you know any good reader as good as you can?
J: Ju-hee. (Korean friend in Korean weekly school)
R: What makes her a good reader?
J: She doesn't make any mistake while reading a textbook. But I make one or two mistakes.
R: Do you think Ju-hee ever comes to something she doesn't know? J: A little.
R: When she comes to something she doesn't know, what do you think she does?
J: If Ju-hee make a mistake, she repeat it again or look around them. or The teacher told her.
R: What is difference between you and her? J: I don't know.
R: If you knew someone was having trouble reading, How would you help that person?
J: Tell him!
R: What did you tell him?
J: Kids tell him what he made mistakes. (Korean weekly school)
R: How would you help that person? J: I will tell hin.
R: How would Ju-hee help you, if you have trouble with reading? J: the same
R: What is something that you don't know? for example how to sound out or the meaning of the words. J: How to sound out, pronunciation.
R: How did you learn to read?
J: Mother read a book to me and I repeat it. My father read "a car" in the picture to me and I repeat it. My father helped me to stand up.
R: What is the relationship between reading and standing up?
J: I can reach the books on the bookself.
R: Now you do not have a problem with reading?
J: No. By the way, I do not have difficult books to read at home, but I have easy books to read.
R: If you read a difficult story, how can you read that? J: Ask my father.
R: If you read alone, J: Just skip it.
R: How can you understand the book if you just skip it?
J: My father read them to me again and I repeat them.
R: If you can read the book, but you can not understand it, what would you do?
J: Ask my father.

R: What would you like to do better as a reader? J: Read a lot of books.
R: Do you think you are a good reader? J: Yes.
R: Why? J: I learned how to read.

Reading Interview(English) JY

R: When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
J: Ask my father.
R: If you read alone, what can you do?
J: Bring them to my father.
R: If you can not find your father, Do you ever do something else?
J: sound out.
R: Who is a Good Reader you know?
J: I do not know.
R: Which school do you attend?
J: A, N, D, and Y,
R: What does it mean?
J: Andy
R: Oh! Andy elementary school.
R: Who is a Good Reader you know in school?
J: I know, my teacher, Mrs. Harpring.
R: What makes her a good reader? J: She learned to read.
R: Do you think your teacher ever comes to something she doesn't know? J: No.
R: Suppose she comes to something she doesn't know, what do you think she would do?
J: Kids tell her.
R: If you knew someone was having trouble reading, How would you help that person?
J: tell him.
R: What would your teacher do to help that person? J: tell him.
R: What would she tell him?
J: She will tell him how to pronounce and the meaning of the words.
R: How did you learn to read?
J: I did not know how to read when I was 7 years-old. I can read now since I practiced ovtime. My English teacher taught me.
R: What did you practice?
J: I wrote several times. I wrote a journal like a funny story. My father wrote the journal for me and I brought them to school.
R: How did your teacher teach to read?
J: My teacher wrote on the blackboard. She read it to me and I followed her.
R: Did you understand it? J: I just repeat it. I know a little.
R: What would you like to do better as a reader?
J: Practice and know the meaning of the words or ask my dad.
R: Do you think you are a good reader? J: No.
R: Why? J: Because there are a lot of difficult words I can't understand.

R: Do you think you are a good reader in Korean? J: No.
R: You said, "You are a good reader in Korean." last time.
J: But, my father said to me, "You can not read Korean very well".
(Second review) I can read silently, but I make a few mistakes while reading orally.

Reading Interview (Korean) KH

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
Read over and over, repeat,
Do you ever do something else? No.
What don't you know? The whole story or content.
2. Who is a Good Reader you know? Su-Min in Korea (Female friend)
3. What makes him a good reader?
She read a lot of books. She likes to read books. She usually read books.
4. Do you think your father ever comes to something he doesn't know? Yes.
5. Suppose she comes to something she doesn't know, What do you think she would do?
She doesn't stop reading and keep reading from the beginning to the end of the story.
She can catch the caption words on the bottom of the T. V. screen so fast because she likes to read books and read them a lot.
6. If you knew someone was having trouble reading, How would you help that person?
Read together,
7. What would your teacher do to help that person?
Tell him the story and repeat them
8. How did you learn to read?
My mom taught me and I dictated the words. She helped me with homeworks.
9. What would you like to do better as a reader?
Read a lot and keep a journal after reading a book. Because I can reflect the story after that.
10. Do you think you are a good reader? So and so

Reading Interview(English) KH

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
Look up words and ask my friends difficult words.
What a difference between Korean and English? Korean is easier than English.
My mon and me look up words in case of English stories, because it is more difficult for my mom to read sometimes.
Do you ever do something else? No.
2. Who is a Good Reader you know? Margret and Amile,
3. What makes them a good reader?
They like to read books. During a break, they read books.
Margrett read so fast. They read books a lot.
4. Do you think your friends ever come to something he doesn't know?

In case of Margrett, No. Amile has some.

5. Suppose she comes to something she doesn't know, What do you think she would do?
   Ask her teacher. How about Amile? Ask friends or a teacher.
   But if friends answer differently, they ask a teacher.
6. If you knew someone was having trouble reading, How would you help that person?
   In case of me, ask my mom. But they don't care and they just play.
7. What would your teacher do to help that person?
   I don't know.
   Explain what to mean and write down the words on the blackboard.
   Ask us dictate the words next day.
8. How did you learn to read?
   I learned English in camp with a small group two times a week. Looking a videotapes, we studied how to write and listen to the tapes.
9. What would you like to do better as a reader?
   Ask a teacher more frequently.
10. Do you think you are a good reader? No.
    Why? I don't like those books I read at school. And I just pretended to read them.
    But I have many books which my dad bought for me. I like those books and read them.

R: What kinds of books do you like?
K: Baby sitter club.
R: What is the relationship between a good reader and your liking?
K: I don't like to read books and I seldom read books. In addition there are a lot of difficult words in the story I don't understand.

Reading Interview (English) JU

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
   Ask parents what it means/
   Do you ever do something else? No,
   What do you think is something you don't know? Words.
2. Who is a Good Reader you know? Bread (male)
3. What makes him a good reader? He reads fast and nicely aloud.
   He doesn't have trouble reading words.
4. Do you think your friend ever comes to something he doesn't know? Words to read? (J)
   Whatever? (R) Yes.
5. When he comes to something he doesn't know, What do you think he would do?
   He just read and think about it.
6. If you knew someone was having trouble reading, how would you help that person?
   Spell it to them. Anythin else? Act out to think.
7. What would your friend, Bread, do to help that person? Tell him some words.
   What would your teacher do to help that person?
8. How did you learn to read?

On weekends, my dad and I sat on the couch and read some books.
9. What would you like to do better as a reader? Understand words I don't understand.
10. Do you think you are a good reader? Bad reader.

Reading Interview(Korean) JU

1. When you are reading and come to something you don't know, what do you do?
JU: You mean understanding the words or just reading the words? R: Both.
JU: When I don't understand words, I just read it and get it out of the lines.
And later on, I go back and check it again and look at the words and study it again.
(R) What do you think about? Sentence.
Do you ever do something else? No.
2. Who is a Good Reader you know? Junyoung.
3. What makes him a good reader? He reads well.
(R) Do you think he can understand once he reads only?
No, not really. But, most of the time he knows what the words mean.
4. Do you think your friend ever comes to something he doesn't know? Yes.
5. When he comes to something he doesn't know, What do you think he would do?
Ask them around,
(R) Anything else? Read the whole sentence over and over again,
6. If you knew someone was having trouble reading, how would you help that person?
Just read the words,
7. What would Junyoung do to help that person? The same thing as I do.
8. How did you learn to read Korean?
Hangul school teacher taught us letters and reading all together.
(R) Tell me more about Hangul school!
She gave us a sheet of papers we were supposed to study at home. So we can recognize the letters at once and understand words at the same time. And it had (all brothers) and it had pictures under the letters. And then it started with words and she gave us colorings sheets and what letters there are in the space we are supposed to color in the different colors. If we got pictures right, she want to know that we know how to read Korean at the pictures also quickly, because we didn't get a right thing. And she want to know we have to practice more.
(R) Did you have a chance to read some stories in class?
We have books for lesson and we sometimes read for fun and so we can learn some new words in the story.
(R) Do you remember any story? Not really.
(R) Do you have any difference between English reading and Korean reading?
(J) Uh, um. English is easier to read for me, since I read more English stuffs than Korean.
(R) I asked the same questions of you in both English reading and Korean reading. For the first question you answered differently. Why did this difference happen? Can you tell me the difference?
(J) Well, English is real easier than Korean for me to understand. Since I learned Korean only Friday afternoon at Korean school, I am so weak in Korean. That's why I read Korean a lot.

(R) What is something you don't know in Korean? (J) Sentence.
(R) You said "words" in English. What is a difference?
(J) I read a real hard books in English. There are a lot of words I can't understand. But I understand sentence very much of them. Sentences are easier to read and so those are the words I can't understand. It is so hard for my age. And in Korean, um, there are a lot of sentences I don't understand and they are all put together. So I just said that I can't understand the whole sentence. In English I read a lot of words I don't understand, but I only gave few in one sentence. So I feel I can only understand few words and I can't understand few words. I can't say I can't understand the whole sentence.
(R) What does it mean by the answer to the question, 3, between English and Korean?
(J) A sort of same in a way, but different in a way too because "fast" means "well" and vice versa. Bread, he makes a good timing, but "fast" means he just read fast because he sometimes doesn't stop at the period and he just keep reading.

Appendix 2: Retelling story

Korean Cinderella (JY)

" Once upon a time, a woman died. Her daugther lived alone. And her father married other mother. The mother commanded her to broil hot water because it was so cold. She commanded her to cool the water because it was so hot.

One day, her stepmother went somewhere and she and her father stayed in the house. But only the daugther cleaned and cooked the rice. By the way there was ox. I am not sure. When she woke up in the morning, there were footmarkers and the basket was filled with something to eat like pear, apple, banana. She saw ox' footprints."

One man went out and they married. The end."

Egyptian Cinderella (KH)

"Cinderella was from Egypt. She has a gold-made slipper. An eagle came and took the slpper to a prince. He received the slipper and he said that I will marry the owner of the slipper. He declared that the owner of the slipper would be a queen. Four people appeared like a stepmother. But they married. That's it."

Retelling story: The Egyptian Cinderella (JU)

"This prince has a girl. She was in Greece. But she was only a young girl, Pirates came and kidnapped her. And he took her to Egypt and sold her for a slave. There were other slaves but they were Egyptians. The girl's name that was stolen by the pirates, her name was Rhodopis. She has very kind owner, but he was always snoozing around. Her bad servants were real mean to her, because they were real mean, and even though they were servants, they made Rhodopis do all the work. They didn't do any other certain works. The owner, um.

One night, Rhodopis started dancing and she danced so well that her feet touched the ground. One day, the owner came and watched and he thought that if a dance with bare foot would be shame. So he ordered that new slippers should be made for Rhodopis. And they were made real pretty. Rhodopis saw it and she just fit it on easy. She started dancing around with slippers like that. Other servants, they were very jealous of Rhodoppis. They gave her more work to do then she really need to. One night, she was tired and she wasn't able to dance even with new slippers.

One day, other stepsisters, or I mean, other servants, they said they were going to meet Pharaoh. They got on a boat and they will gonna sail away. They gonna sail away. Rhodopis thought they let her go too, but they didn't. So she have to stay behind. And they went, They Pharaoh's having a sort like a party maybe and something real important. He didn't really sit in the front. He would like to go around the adventure, Egypt. He was world and capt on the onion. And then before that, falcon came and took Rhodopis's slipper and he put and fell the slipper. And Pharaoh has a slipper. Pharaoh said whoever has foot fit this slipper will be queen. Everybody left and he went and

started going around Egypt. Every woman has to try it on. When servants came, they were angry to see the whole place empty and so they started going back and then every woman and child so that try to fit the step to fit it on it, but either too big or too small. And the servants tried to squash to fit in it, but they fit into the slipper. Pharaoh was about to go back and home. Right then he saw Rhodopis picking some bushes. He said you try it on. She fit it in easily. Pharaoh said, "She is gonna be a queen." But the servant blurred out, "She is not even Egyptian." And Pharaoh said, "She was." He said that she looked like other stuffs in Egyptian. He married her and she became a queen. I think I couldn't say the whole story.